OUR GREATEST QUESTION.

CONSOLIDATION OR NOT?

Conflicts Between Federal and State Authority.

I.

THE CALIFORNIA CASE.

Two decisions on constitutional questions were made by the Supreme Court of the United States at its last term which are open to very grave criticism. The first of these which I shall notice is the case of NEAGLE, the deputy marshal who killed TERRY last August in California, in defence of Mr. Justice FIELD. The important facts are the following:

"In August, 1888, Mr. Justice FIELD, presiding in the Circuit Court of the United States at San Francisco, along with Judge SAWYER, Circuit Judge, and Judge SABIN, District Judge of Nevada, had occasion to punish DAVID S. TERRY and his wife for an outrageous contempt of court. TERRY was sentenced to imprisonment for six months and his wife for one month. During their imprisonment and after their release both of them openly threatened to take the life of Judge FIELD at the first opportunity. These threats, made in the hearing of respectable witnesses, became so notorious that the Attorney-General of the United States authorized Mr. FRANKS, the United States Marshal, to detail an officer to attend Judge FIELD wherever he might be in the California circuit, and to defend him against any violence that might be offered to him by TERRY or his wife. It was believed by the Attorney-General and by the Marshal and the District Attorney that Judge FIELD's life would be in danger from the TERRYS if he should ever enter that State again. The Judge went to California again in the summer of 1889 to discharge his official duties as the Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States assigned to that circuit. The Marshal directed one of his deputies, DAVID NEAGLE, to attend Judge FIELD and protect him. NEAGLE accompanied the Judge wherever he travelled after he returned to California, NEAGLE being armed with a revolver, but the Judge himself carrying no weapon of any kind. On the 14th of August Judge FIELD, accompanied by NEAGLE, was travelling from Los Angeles, where he had held a circuit court, to San Francisco, where he was to hold another circuit court. When the train stopped at Fresno for a moment early in the morning, TERRY and his wife entered it. The train next stopped at Lathrop for breakfast. Judge FIELD, attended by NEAGLE, went into the saloon in the station house to obtain breakfast, and they took seats together at one of the tables. Shortly after TERRY and his wife entered the room. Mrs. TERRY recognized Judge FIELD, and went out in great haste. TERRY passed beyond the Judge and took a seat at another table. It was afterward ascertained that Mrs. TERRY went to the car and took from it a satchel in which was a revolver. Before she returned to the eating room TERRY arose from his seat and passed behind Judge FIELD, who did not see him or notice him. The Judge was sitting with his feet under the table. TERRY struck him a blow on one side of his face and repeated it on the other side. TERRY also had his arm drawn back and his fist doubled up, apparently to strike a third blow. NEAGLE sprang up with his revolver in his hand, and in a very loud voice shouted: 'Stop, stop! I am an officer!' TERRY, recognizing NEAGLE, immediately thrust his hand into his bosom as if for the purpose of drawing a bowie knife. At this instant NEAGLE fired two shots from his revolver into the body of TERRY, who immediately sank down and died in a few minutes. Mrs. TERRY entered the room with a satchel in her hand just after TERRY sank to the floor. She first threw herself upon his body in great excitement. In a few seconds she arose and called upon the bystanders *to examine her husband's clothing and see that he had no weapon*. In all probability she had taken the bowie knife from her husband's body and concealed it without the observation of the bystanders. All the circumstances made it apparent that it was the purpose of TERRY to draw Judge FIELD into a quarrel, and to kill him if he should defend himself. There could be no question that under the circumstances NEAGLE, as a friend of Judge FIELD, or even as a mere bystander, was fully justified in killing TERRY. Mrs. TERRY afterward made a charge of murder against Judge FIELD and NEAGLE before a Justice of the Peace, who issued a warrant for their arrest. From this arrest Judge FIELD was discharged on his own recognizance. NEAGLE was committed to the custody of CUNNINGHAM, Sheriff of San Joaquin county, to answer a charge of murder in a court of the State. From this commitment he was discharged on habeas corpus by the United States Circuit Court, in which proceeding Judge FIELD took no part. The Sheriff appealed from the order of the Circuit Court discharging NEAGLE to the Supreme Court of the United States."

The question to be determined on these facts was whether there was any existing law of the United States under which NEAGLE was acting when he killed TERRY. Unless there was such a law, the Circuit Court of the United States could not discharge NEAGLE on habeas corpus from the custody of a Sheriff who held him for trial in a State court on a charge of murder. Under section 753 of the Revised Statutes of the United States NEAGLE could be so discharged by a Federal court if it appeared that he was "in custody for an act done or committed under a law of the United States," or was "in custody in violation of the Constitution, or a law or treaty of the United States." If neither of these conditions appeared to be the fact, a Federal court could not have jurisdiction to discharge NEAGLE from the process by which he was held for trial in a court of the State of California.

The opinion of a majority of the Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States was delivered by Mr. Justice MILLER. It admitted that there was no existing statute of the United States under which NEAGLE was acting when he killed TERRY. The conclusion that NEAGLE was "acting under the authority of the *law* of the United States" was deduced by Judge MILLER not from a statute of the United States, but from the mass of the executive powers of the Constitution, and especially from the President's power and duty to faithfully execute the laws of the United States.

The reasoning was this: The Judiciary being a department of the Government, the members of which must be protected in the discharge of their official duties, and the President being charged with the execution of the laws, and acting through the Department of Justice, it was competent to the President to detail an officer of the latter department to attend the person of Judge FIELD while in the discharge of his official duties, and to defend him against personal violence. It was held, with entire correctness, that Justice FIELD, while travelling from one place in his circuit, where he had been holding a court, to another place in the same circuit to which he was going in order to discharge the same functions, was just as much employed in the discharge of his judicial duties as if he had been sitting in court when TERRY assaulted him.

But assuming this to be unquestionable, unless there was a law of the United States under which NEAGLE was acting when he killed TERRY, he was not acting when he committed the homicide as an officer of the United States defending another officer of the United States, but he was acting as a friend of Judge FIELD, or as a bystander would have been authorized to act under the same circumstances; and he was amenable to the courts of California, in a trial which would determine whether the killing was murder or justifiable homicide. Nothing can be plainer than this. Yet it was held by a majority of the Judges of the Supreme Court that, although Congress had not legislated to provide this kind of protection of the person of a Federal Judge, the President could detail an officer from the Department of Justice for this purpose, and even authorize him to take the life of an assailant, because the President is authorized and bound to execute the laws of the United States.

There can be no question that under the Constitution Congress is authorized to make any law that is necessary and proper to enable the Judges and all other officers of the United States to discharge their official duties by protecting their persons when they are so engaged. But in the absence of such legislation, the President cannot make a law for the case, or assume that there is such a law of the United States because Congress is authorized to make such a law if it sees fit. While the opinion of Mr. Justice MILLER makes very clear the power of the Government of the United States to afford to its officers of every description all needful protection in the discharge of their official duties, it entirely fails to show that there was any existing law of the United States under which NEAGLE was acting when he killed TERRY. A power of the Constitution which requires legislation before it can be executed, cannot be exercised solely because Congress is authorized to provide the legislation.

The dissenting opinion in this case, delivered by Mr. Justice LAMAR, and concurred in by Chief Justice FULLER, expresses with entire accuracy, in my judgment, what ought to have been the decision; and this I think will be the conclusion of the judicial mind of the nation. It points out, with great perspicuity and exactness, that the sole question was whether there was a statute law of the United States under which NEAGLE was acting when he shot TERRY. It shows, by reasoning which I think conclusive, that Congress had ample power to pass any law necessary and proper to protect the persons of all officers of the United States when engaged in the performance of their official duties; but inasmuch as Congress had not provided such legislation, it cannot be said that there was any law of the United States which authorized the President to detail an officer of the Department of Justice for this purpose, and to clothe him with authority to take the life of any person who should assail Judge FIELD, or put him in danger of bodily harm. The dissenting opinion did not question that NEAGLE was justified under the circumstances in killing TERRY on the spot, as any friend of Judge FIELD or any bystander would have been; but it held that NEAGLE was amenable to the courts of California on a charge of murder, on which trial he would undoubtedly have been acquitted. It was therefore rightfully held by the two dissenting Judges that a Federal court could not discharge NEAGLE on habeas corpus from the custody of the Sheriff of San Joaquin county.

It is always to be regretted when the Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, in deciding a constitutional question, appear to have divided on party lines. This, however, is sometimes unavoidable. The Judges comprising the majority in this case, six in number, owed their appointment to the Republican party. The two Judges composing the minority owed their appointment to the Democratic party, while Mr. Justice FIELD did not sit in this case or take any part in the decision. It has been the well-known tendency of the Republican party to magnify the Federal powers at the expense of the State sovereignties, and the equally well-known tendency of the Democratic party to defend the State powers against encroachments by the Federal authority. These tendencies are just as apparent in the Judges of the Supreme Court as they are in other public men occupying prominent places of great responsibility. In the present case the Republican majority have taken a long stride toward a greater consolidation than any that has been taken by the Supreme Federal Judiciary; and for this reason I have called to this case the serious attention of the people.

II.

THE IOWA PROHIBITION CASE.

It would be diverting if it were not melancholy to read the platforms of Republican Conventions wherein they express their desire to promote the cause of temperance, and call upon Congress to bestow on the States power to pass and enforce prohibitory liquor laws, whether the liquor is brought within their limits and sold in "original packages" or otherwise. If the Democratic methods of interpreting the Federal Constitution had prevailed, the present muddle of Federal and State authority would not have arisen.

The high-strung notions of the Republican party about the commercial power of Congress have caused a state of things with which it is very difficult to deal; and the late decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, which has denied to the States all power to prohibit the sale within their own borders of liquors brought into them from other States, because the liquor remains in the "original package" in which the consignee received it, and because such prohibition would be in conflict with the power of Congress to regulate commerce among the several States, has carried dismay among the friends of prohibitory liquor laws throughout the Union. Their dismay will not be lessened when it is found, as it will be, that the idea of Congress bestowing on the States, by an act of Federal legislation, power to do something which the Supreme Court has held that the States cannot now do, is a mere chimera.

There is no way out of this difficulty, unless the Supreme Court shall, on a reargument of the constitutional question, revise and reverse its late decision on the Iowa prohibition law. It was a decision made by a majority of the bench, and they can, if they will, revise and reverse it. The friends of prohibition will be satisfied with nothing less; and the friends of a sound interpretation of the Constitution will not acquiesce in such an enormous stretch of Federal authority as a majority of the court have made. It is so large a stride toward consolidation that it completely prostrates the police power of the States, and this cannot be submitted to.

The greatest obstacle to the adoption of the Constitution, when it was first promulgated, was the fear that the Government to be established under it would absorb the powers of the States. For this reason the States insisted on the adoption of an amendment which would declare that "the powers not delegated by this Constitution to the United States, or prohibited by it to the States, are reserved respectively to the States or to the people." Accordingly it has been the duty of all persons administering the Federal Government, whether in the executive, the legislative, or the judicial departments, to avoid encroachments upon the powers of the States, and to draw the line between the powers which the Constitution has delegated to the United States, or has prohibited to the States, and those which are reserved to the States or to the people. It is not difficult to do this, so long as certain cardinal rules are observed; and one of these rules is that in all cases of doubt, in order to avoid a conflict between Federal and State authority, the doubt should be resolved in favor of the latter.

One of the most clearly reserved powers of every State is its police power, which comprehends everything relating to health, good morals, good order, life, property, and other personal and home rights, that can be the subject of legislation. No provision of the Federal Constitution should ever be so interpreted as to impair or endanger the police power of the States. The happiness, security, and welfare of the people of every State require that this power should be sedulously preserved.

In general, the Supreme Court of the United States has been careful not to assert the authority of the Federal Government at the expense of the police power of the States; but the late decision on the Iowa Prohibition law, based as it is upon very exaggerated ideas concerning the power of Congress to regulate commerce among the several States, has made a greater encroachment upon the police powers of the States than has ever been made before. And now, in order to get out of the difficulty, it is proposed that Congress, by an act of Federal legislation, shall bestow on the States power to do that which the Supreme Court has said they cannot do, as the Federal Constitution stands! In other words, it is proposed that Congress shall confer a power on the States, not in a case where there is a concurrent power in Congress and in the States to act on the same subject matter, but in a case in which the power is exclusively in the one Government or in the other.

The sole question in the Iowa case was: When does an article of merchandise, transported from one State into another, cease to be a subject of inter-State commerce, and become part of the mass of personal property within the State? Does it continue to be a subject of inter-State commerce after it has reached the hands of the consignee, or, at the moment of its reaching his hands, has the commercial power of Congress over it ceased, and has it then become subject to the police power of the State? It would seem very obvious that the latter is the true answer to the question. But a majority of the Judges of the Supreme Court have held that in the hands of the consignee the article is still a subject of inter-State commerce, so long as he does not break the "original package" in which he received it; and that in that form he may sell it, in spite of a State law which prohibits a sale of the article within the State, in any form or quantity or package whatever.

This decision may hold liquor, but if I may make use of a common and expressive phrase, it will not "hold water."

III.

A REMEDY PROPOSED.

The late decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on the Iowa Prohibition law was based upon the position that an article of merchandise, transported from one State into another, remains subject to the power of Congress to regulate commerce among the several States, not only while it is *in transitu*, but even after it has reached the hands of the consignee, so long as he keeps it in the "original package" in which it was sent to him, and that in that form he may sell it within the State, notwithstanding the State prohibits a sale of the article in any form, quantity, or package whatever. There can be no question of the power of Congress to regulate the transportation of merchandise from one State into another by protecting it on the passage; nor can there be much doubt of the power of Congress to determine what articles of merchandise may and what may not be transported from one State into another. But it is admited by the Supreme Court that the true test of the point of time at which the article becomes subject to the police power of the State into which it has been brought is when it has been incorporated with the mass of personal property in the State. A majority of the Judges have held that the article is not incorporated with the mass of personal property within the State, so long as the consignee holds it in the "original package." The original package may be a barrel, a quart, or a pint bottle of liquor, or even a single glass in a small phial. In each of these forms and quantities, according to the doctrine of this decision, the liquor may be sold by the consignee within the State, against the express will of the State, because it remains in the hands of the consignee, a subject of the inter-State commercial power of Congress.

If we apply analogies as the proper test of this question, it becomes at once apparent that the decision is wrong. An article of merchandise brought from one State into another is surely incorporated with the mass of personal property within the State, for the purposes of State taxation, when it has reached the hands of the consignee. Such taxation does not curtail the power of the consignee to order or to receive the merchandise. So, too, if in the judgment of the State the use of the article be deleterious to good morals, good order, public safety, or the public health, it is, like every article of property within the State, in the hands of an inhabitant of the State, subject to the police power of the State, both in respect to its protection as an article of property and to the prohibition of its sale. If it is stolen, or improperly removed from the possession of the owner, he may replevy it, and the trespasser may be indicted for larceny, under the process of the State courts. It makes no difference that the article came from another State, so long as the consignee has a property in it. If he is entitled to have it protected as property while he holds it, he must submit to the power of the State to prohibit a sale of it within the borders of the State. He may sell and transport it beyond the limits of the State, but he may not sell it within the State, if the State forbids the latter; and so long as it remains within the State, and the owner has not actually taken steps to send it out of the State, it is subject to the State power of taxation.

I now direct public attention to the extraordinary remedy that is proposed to palliate the state of things produced by the late decision.

The Supreme Court having made the decision which I have described, in its opinion Mr. Justice MILLER uttered what lawyers call an *obiter dictum*, to the effect that, notwithstanding the States, under the Constitution as it stands, cannot prohibit the sale in original packages of liquors brought into the State from another State, for the reasons assigned in the opinion of the majority of the court, yet that Congress may, if it sees fit, bestow that power on the States by an act of Federal legislation. This has led to the introduction into the Senate of the United States of a bill to authorize the States to prohibit the sale of merchandise in bulk, which the Supreme Court says they cannot now prohibit. This bill has been followed by desultory discussions, in which it is apparent that our Federal legislators do not know how to act. The bill has been amended several times, but the latest substitute proposed is as follows:

"That fermented, distilled, or other intoxicating liquors transported as an article of commerce or brought into any State or Territory from a point or place outside of such State or Territory for use, consumption, or sale therein, shall not be exempt, nor shall the owner or person in possession thereof be exempt, from the regulation, control, police, or taxing power of such State or Territory affecting or applicable to all other like property, by reason of such liquors being in the original packages of importation or transportation as subjects of inter-State or foreign commerce."

It seems to be forgotten that the Constitution of the United States was established by the people of the States composing the Union at the time of its adoption. While for the purposes of decision between party and party in litigated cases, it is for the Supreme Court to interpret the powers of Congress, and assuming that on the present subject the court has made a right decision, nothing short of an amendment of the Constitution can cure the difficulty which that decision has caused. To hold that Congress can confer on the States a power that they do not now possess would be to hold that the creature can act as if it were the creator. The American idea of government is that the people are the source of all power; that they make and unmake Governments at their pleasure; and when the people of the several States, by the Federal Constitution, created a legislative body called the Congress, and gave to it certain limited and defined powers of legislation, they gave that body no authority over or power to affect the Constitution excepting by proposing amendments to be submitted to the State Legislatures, or by calling a Federal Convention for the proposal of amendments. When Congress has to exercise any of its powers of legislation, it must interpret the Constitution for itself and determine what its legislative powers are. But when it comes to a question how a State is to be *authorized* to exercise its reserved powers, it is perfectly clear that Congress can do nothing but to propose such amendments of the Constitution as may be needful, or else to call a Federal Convention for the same purpose. Congress can no more confer on the States power to do something which they cannot now do than it can by legislation determine what the reserved powers of the States are. By no legislation whatever can Congress enlarge or diminish the reserved powers of the States.

It matters little, in my judgment, by what process of words Congress shall undertake to legislate so as to vest in the States a power which the Supreme Court has declared they do not now possess under the Constitution. A majority of the Senators appear to assume that the late decision of the court in the Iowa case is to be taken as correct; and however they may differ about the *dictum* of the court, which suggested that Congress can cure the difficulty, they must, if they legislate at all, act as if it were true that Congress can bestow a power on the States, by legislation, which the court denies to them. It was to have been expected that Republican legislators would accept the doctrines of a Republican court, but the dilemma is a very serious one. The friends of prohibition, and the friends of a sound interpretation of the Constitution, must now see the consequences of maintaining such extreme doctrines of the Congressional power to regulate commerce among the several States. For these doctrines, the country is indebted to the Republican party. All that can now be done is to appeal to the judicial mind of the nation to correct all interpretations of the Constitution which threaten to annihilate the police power of the States.

The judicial mind of the nation is a tribunal of public opinion, composed, first, of sound constitutional lawyers, many of whom are quite as well qualified to determine constitutional questions as the Judges of the Supreme Court. This tribunal of public opinion, moreover, includes all intelligent laymen who are accustomed to consider such subjects and form correct opinions on them. It is rather an august body, and it is the one by which all decisions of the Supreme Court must ultimately be revised. As a private citizen, it is my habit to consider a decision of the Supreme Court on a constitutional question as binding upon the parties in a litigated case. It is also binding upon all inferior judicial tribunals, State or national, as a precedent that is to govern future litigated cases in which the same question arises. But on the Executive or on Congress such a decision is not binding. It is entitled to great respect, according to the weight and character of the reasoning, and this is all. I have criticised freely two decisions of the court, in the firm conviction that they are wrong. In making the decision in the Iowa prohibition law the Judges do not seem to have divided on party lines. Nevertheless, it is true that the doctrines maintained are doctrines of the Republican party; and they never would have culminated in the late decision of the court if they had not been long maintained by a party which has carried Federal powers to extreme lengths. GEO. TICKNOR CURTIS.

RICHFIELD SPRINGS, July 3.

POEMS WORTH READING.

Pre-existence.

From the Spanish of Francisco Sellen.

I have lived before. Where? That I cannot tell,
Nor how, nor when. Of those forgotten years
Only vague echoes from the darkness swell,
Bringing familiar murmurs to my ears.

The ghostly image of that misty past
Enfolds me like a shadow; and my sense
Strives all in vain to grasp and hold it fast;
Only in me is memory's evidence.

All human language feeble is and cold,
To paint the fleeting visions that arise,
Beguiling me with memories of old,
Of other lives passed under other skies.

And still the echoes ring, the voices call,
In wild confusion, like a crowd of dreams;
Then twilight shadows, dark and darker, fall,
Till not a ray through the dense blackness gleams.

But still again a vague, melodious song,
With scattered, broken measures fills the air;
And shadowy forms, in shadowy distance, throng,
Wrapt in the sable mantle of despair.

My soul mounts upward into loftier spheres
Where, beyond boundaries of time and space,
I lived and loved before these earthly years
Chained me, an exile, in my present place.

I see, in fleeting rays of heavenly light,
The glory of a distant paradise;
Then all is overwhelmed by starless night,
My anxious questionings meet no replies.

Heavy my heart with memories of old;
My power to live and strive is overcast
By wild desire the mystery to unfold,
Which binds my present to that vanished past.

This is my heritage of sorrow now,
That veiled and unknown form which once I wore;
I cannot fathom when, nor where, nor how,
I only know that I have lived before.

HELEN S. CONANT.

A Comparison.

From the Commercial Gazette.

I'd ruther lay out here among the trees,
With the singing birds and the bum'l bees,
A-knowing that I can do as I please,
Than to live what folks call a life of ease
Up thar in the city.

Fer I really don't 'zactly understan'
Where the comfort is fer any man
In walkin' hot bricks an' usin' a fan,
An' enjoyin' himself as he says he can
Up thar in the city.

It's kinder lonesome, mebbe you'll say,
A livin' out here day after day
In this kinder easy, careless way;
But a hour out here is better'n a day
Up thar in the city.

As fer that, jus' look at the flowers aroun',
A peepin' their heads up all over the groun',
An' the fruit a-bendin' the trees 'way down,
You don't find such things as these in town,
Or, ruther, in the city.

As I said afore, such things as these,
The flowers, the birds and the bum'l bees,
An' a-livin' out here among the trees,
Where you can take your ease, an' do as you please,
Makes it better'n the city.

Now, all the talk don't 'mount to snuff
'Bout this kinder life a-bein' rough,
An' I'm sure it's plenty good enough,
An' 'tween you an' me, 't ain't half as tough
As livin' in the city.

JAMES WHITCOMB RILEY.

Wings.

From St. Nicholas.

"Oh, I am dying, dying!" said the worm.
"I feel thick darkness closing o'er my eye;
All things fall from me with my breaking sheath.
Good-by, sweet leaf! Oh, dear, green world, good-by."

Then the dull mask that had enclosed him fell
Still further. Oh, what lofty space, what light!
And, all about, what happy hovering things
Like blossom petals that had taken flight!

And fluttering, stretching on the air he spread
Great gauzy wings that let the sunshine through;
Forgot that he had ever been a worm,
And far off in the strange new depths he flew.

HARRIET PRESCOTT SPOFFORD.

The Springs of Fontana.

From the Athenæum.

The springs of Fontana well high on the mountain;
Out of the rock of the granite they pour
Twenty or more;
Ripple and runnel and freshet and fountain
Well, happy tears from the heart of the mountain
Up at Fontana.

See, not a step can we take but a spring
Breaks from the roots of the blood-flower'd chestnuts—
(Look, in the water their long golden breast-knots
Flung in caress)—from a tuft of the ling,
From a stone, anything,
Up at Fontana.

Twenty or more, and no one of the twenty
Gushes the same; here the waters abundant
Babble redundant,
Filling the vale with the bruit of their plenty;
Here a mere ripple, a trickle, a scanty
Dew on Fontana.

Surely one noonday the Prophet in heaven
Slept, and the wand of the desert fell,
Fell to the rock, and the rock was riven;
Lo, all around it eternally well,
A miracle,
The springs of Fontana.

Waters of boon,
In drought or in deluge unaltered, your current
Flows from the rock and is icy in June,
Flows when the icicle hangs on the torrent,
Flows when the river is dry, and the noon
Parches Fontana.

Over the rocks,
Over the tree-root that tangles and blocks;
Robbing from all that resists you a sunny
Scent of the cistus and rock-hidden honey,
Yarrow, campanula, thyme, agrimony;
Flow from Fontana!

Flow, happy waters, and gather and rally,
Rush to the plain,
Flow to the heavenly fields of Limain,
Rise as a dream in the folds of the valley;
Feed them and fatten with blossom and grain,
Springs of Fontana.

River of springs,
Born many times in renewal unending,
Bright, irresistible, purest of things,
Blessing the rocks that oppose you, befriending
Pastures and cattle and men in your wending
Forth from Fontana.

Born, who knows how, a mysterious fountain
Out of the stone and the dust of the mountain,
Bound to a country we know little of,
How shall I bless ye and praise ye enough,
Image of Love,
Springs of Fontana!

A. MARY F. ROBINSON.

Amateur Photography.

From the Century.

I fell in love with Phyllis Brown;
She was the nicest girl in town.
Her father had a bank account
Of a superfluous amount;
And so the more I thought of it
The clearer seemed the benefit
That such a union would confer
At least on me; perhaps on her.
For she was pretty. Such a nose!
Such grace of curves! Such tint of rose!
Such sylph like elegance of pose!
Such sunny eyes of heavenly blue,
With little cherubs peeping through!
Such golden bangs! Oh, every such
Was the superlative of much!

And educated! She could speak
Italian, Spanish, Volapeek,
French, Russian, Swedish, Danish, Dutch;
And every language born of Babel,
To read and speak them she was able.
So learned, pretty, rich besides,
Yes, she would be the gem of brides!
And I, though poor, had every taste,
The wealth of Crœsus would have graced;
So I resolved to risk my fate
In winning such an equal mate.

At first my chances promised fair;
She met me half way everywhere;
Accepted my civilities,
And sometimes made me ill at ease
When I on parting held her hand
And felt that mute "You understand,"
Expressed by just the faintest squeeze.
I cannot think she was a flirt,
And yet she did it to my hurt!

One day I crossed the Rubicon:
I knew her father must have gone;
I rang her doorbell inly bent
On knowing if she would consent.
She sent me down a little note,
The coolest that she ever wrote:

"Excuse me, please, from seeing you,
I've something else that I must do;
I'll see you later if we live."

I asked the footman if he knew
Why such an answer she should give;
The servant shrewdly shook his head;
"She's busy, sir," he gravely said,
"Developing a negative."

NATHAN HASKELL DOLE.

A Woman Who Is Rather Tired.

From the London Hawk.

O, to be alone!
To escape from the work, the play,
The talking, every day;
To escape from all I have done,
And all that remains to do.
To escape, yes, even from you,
My only love, and be
Alone and free.

Could I only stand
Between gray moor and gray sky,
Where the winds and the plovers cry,
And no man is at hand;
And feel the free wind blow
On my rain wet face, and know
I am free, not yours, but my own,
Free and alone!

For the soft fire-light
And the home of your heart, my dear,
They hurt being always here.
I want to stand up upright,
And to cool my eyes in the air,
And to see how my back can bear
Burdens, to try, to know,
To learn, to grow!

I am only you!
I am yours, part of you, your wife!
And I have no other life.
I cannot think, cannot do;
I cannot breathe, cannot see;
There is "us," but there is not "me"—
And worst, at your kiss, I grow
Contented so.

At Nantasket Beach.

From the Boston Courier.

Hand in hand they walked along
Beside the sunlit sea.
They heard the wavelet's summer song—
A wondrous melody.

"Oh! how I love you, love!" he said,
"How dear you are to me!"
The maiden drooped her pretty head,
But not a word said she.

"Wilt thou be mine, my love?" said he,
While grasping her soft hand.
"Oh! don't make love just now," said she,
"My shoes are full of sand."

HEBREWS AND CATHOLICS.

An Interesting Discovery at Avignon—Where the Jews Set an Example that Irish Catholics Should Now Follow.

PARIS, June 24, 1890.—I learn from *l'Univers* of this date of a discovery which cannot fail to be most interesting to all American scholars. It relates to the establishment of a printers' association in Avignon, then a Papal city, in 1444. The discovery was made by a priest of Avignon, the Abbé Requin, who, while examining for quite a different purpose the official registers of the city notaries, stumbled upon a series of contracts recorded there, all pertaining to the new and wonderful art of printing.

The discovery of these contracts and a transcript of the same were communicated to Mr. Léopold Delisle, the Director-General of the National Library (*Bibliotheque Nationale*) of Paris, the man in all Europe best able to judge of the authenticity of the Avignon records. The contracts in question are, says M. Delisle, probably the most ancient original attestation known at this day concerning the very first beginning of the printer's art.

I here reproduce the substance of Abbé Requin's statements as contained in a pamphlet just published:

"In the beginning of the year 1444, a jeweler of Prague named Procopius Waldfoghel, who had settled in Avignon, revealed to a Jew of that city, Davin de Caderousse, a new method of writing. (*Scientia et practica scribendi*). Two years later, on March 10, Waldfoghel undertakes to deliver to Davin, within a very brief delay, the material necessary for reproducing Hebrew texts. (*Facere et factas reddere et restituere viginti-septem litteras ebraeycas formatas, scisas in ferro * * * una cum ingenos de fustil, de stagno et de ferro.*) The Jew binds himself to keep the deepest secrecy regarding the principles and practice of the art to which he was thus initiated.

"On the 26th of the same month Procopius made the Jew renew this promise of secrecy when he handed over to the latter the materials necessary for reproducing Latin texts (*omnia artificia, ingenia et instrumenta ad scribendum artificialiter in littera latina*)."

We now must go back to the first transaction between these two in 1444. On July 4 of that year Procopius Waldfoghel acknowledged to having in his house printing materials belonging to a student of Avignon, Master Manaud Vital, a native of the diocese of Dax, in Gascony. These materials are described as "two alphabets of brass and two forms (types) in iron, * * * forty-eight forms in tin, as well as divers other forms pertaining to the art of writing."

Two years later, in 1446, this same Master Manaud withdraws from the society which Procopius had entered into with him and with another Avignonese student, Girard Ferrose. Manaud thereupon declares on oath that the art to which he had been initiated "is a true art, a most true art, and that the exercise thereof was easy and profitable to all who had the will and the taste to practice it."

On Aug. 17, 1446, Procopius obtained from a capitalist, Georges de la Jardine, the funds necessary to begin printing at once, with the understanding that their process should be kept a strict secret.

Such is the matter now engaging the attention of the learned in France. As the notarial acts in the Registry Office of Avignon are entered there in chronological order, while the contracts mentioned bear no date, the question arises, whether these contracts were not drawn up several months or years before the date of registration.

At any rate, credit must be given to the then city of the Popes for the earliest recorded attempt to print with cast or manufactured types. Moreover, we find that the Jews of Avignon, with the keen intelligence which invariably characterized their race, were among the first to take up and encourage the art of printing, and that under the Pontifical Government.

This brings me to speak of the editorial article in THE SUN of June 12th inst., entitled "The Jews Ahead." The extraordinary success of Jewish pupils in the New York grammar-school examination is not an unprecedented or singular phenomenon. The anti-semitic journals of Berlin angrily denounce a like result in the public schools of the capital of Germany. The anti-semitic press of Austria declaims, on the other hand, against the fact that Jewish professors have captured nearly all the professorships in the national University of Vienna. Here in Paris the success of the Jewish youth on all lines of intellectual competition is not to be denied.

In every country where this ancient race is free to compete with the non-Jewish natives, the superior intelligence of the former becomes manifest. This is a fact from which the Christian populations of all countries, of such countries, especially, as our own, where every race and every class only demand a free field and no favor, must take a timely lesson.

In an interview which I had some months ago with Baron Hirsch, he mentioned the universally acknowledged success of the Jews, both in the East and in the West, as due solely to their intellectual superiority. In giving to the Russian Government $20,000,000 for the establishment of public schools throughout the empire, the Baron had explained to me in a preceding conversation that he gave this great sum on the express condition that Jewish children should be admitted to these schools on a footing of perfect equality with their Christian neighbors, and without being obliged to wear any of these badges of inferiority or discrimination, civil or religious, hitherto imposed on the Hebrew race to lower and degrade them. The Baron said that he had also covenanted that in all these schools the pupils should be taught the principles of a sound industrial and commercial education, enabling them, on beginning public life, to become good business men.

His principal end, as he again and again explained to me, is, not to enable the Jews to acquire a social or religious superiority over the Christain people with whom they mix, but, rather, to enable their children, by being thus brought up on a footing of perfect equality with Christian children, to fraternize with these in the school room first, and then afterwards in every walk and pursuit of public life. Thereby, if the Christian society around them were only true in practice to its own profession and moral ideals, the Jewish youth would be gradually won over to the Gospel truth, instead of becoming a hostile or antagonistic element in the nation.

Such is Baron Hirsch's theory. I do not discuss it here. But what he says on this matter, what he has done, what his enormous wealth and more than regal generosity may yet prompt him to do are well worthy of serious consideration.

I had spoken to him of another ancient race—one of the oldest Christian nations in Europe—amid which we have the same manifestations of superior intelligence, although during centuries generation after generation of their children had been degraded by systematic intellectual starvation, as well as by a chronic poverty, the effect of a cruel and skilfully devised land-law system, which made, or sought to make, the Irish peasant a more wretched being than the Esquimau of Davis Straits or the inhabitants of Tierra del Fuego or northern Australia.

I had seen in Ireland the Catholic youth of town and country, though heavily and hopelessly handicapped in their competition with the splendidly endowed Protestant schools, assert in the public examinations the same superiority which THE SUN now attributes to the Hebrew pupils of our New York grammar schools. But in Ireland the army of boys yearly sent out by the Christian Brothers have, to exercise to any practical purpose, neither native industries, nor trades, nor commerce.

What is the use of a young man having a splendid education and a superior intelligence if the Government which rules the destinies of his country provides no career for the exercise of the highest abilities, developed to the very highest point?

A man may have great strength, great agility, and exhaustless stores of will power to use and apply these gifts; but of what use are they, or what can he do if you bind him hand and foot, and thus take away from him all opportunity of displaying his talents, natural and acquired?

Leaving, however, for the moment at least, the subject of poor Ireland, I come to what this same Irish race established in the United States can and ought to do to promote, cultivate, and develop the bright and quick intelligence which, thank God, the secular oppression and the long-enforced ignorance of British misrule have not been able to extinguish.

You say, in your editorial, that Jewish parents take an active and untiring interest in helping their children to profit by the teaching of the common schools. "The boys and girls," you say, "are not sent to school and there left to pursue their education with no other help than they get from books and teachers. They are stimulated to acquirement by the home influences; and Jewish fathers and mothers glory in their proficiency and applaud their ambition for superiority. Under such domestic training it is reasonable to suppose that these children would take a high stand in the schools."

All honor to such parents, and all honor as well to the children who profit by such "home influence" and by the best instruction the schools can afford them!

I am principally concerned here with the hope of stimulating Irish Catholics in the United States to take example from their Jewish fellow citizens. I do not forget no Catholic can, that the Church imperatively demands that our parochial schools should impart not instruction merely, but Christian education: that is, that the teaching of our elementary as well as of our university schools should be impregnated with Christian truth and Christian morality. The practical virtues we enjoin should be the same as those taught in the Gospel and from the pulpit. The living examples held out by master and mistress in the grammar school, by professor and scientist in the university, should be those given in their own conduct by priest and parent.

This schooling and training, as compared with the neutral or ungodly education imparted in "non-confessional" schools, is growing more and more in favor in our own country. We want to educate for the republic true Christian men and women, not pagan citizens.

No nation, no race under the heavens, not excepting the Jews, has endured and sacrificed so much to retain the sacred privilege of educating their sons and daughters Christians as the Catholics of Ireland. The great work with which I have been busy during the last two years, which in a few months will be in the hands of American readers, will demonstrate to our generous and fair-minded public what a mighty struggle the Irish Catholic population has had to pass through to acquire anything like the privilege of having Christian schools for the education of youth.

The battle, as yet, is scarcely won; but we firmly hope for the victory.

As I ardently wish to see every child of Irish parentage born beneath the ægis of our Constitution becoming in manhood or womanhood a useful and noble member of the community, so do I now with all my heart pray both parents and pastors to labor unitedly in procuring for the Catholic youth of the country the highest possible instruction—knowledge illuminated by the blessed teaching of revealed truth; and labor also together to give them that education of the heart moulded on the precepts and examples of the Man-God.

Yes, turning my steps homeward now in my old age, after a long study of European peoples and States, it is my wish and my hope to see our beloved country saved in the present and the future from the evils which are fast destroying the Christendom of our fathers.

I have no fears from the growth of the Hebrew race among us, nor from its increase in wealth and intelligence, so long as it is true to its own religious belief, and so long as our great American people worship in mind and heart the God of their fathers, and also keep true to the ideals which have ever been the light of American homes.

If there were any one thing which I could wish my own countrymen and co-religionists to do, to bind together in one great and indissoluble moral alliance, framed to assist the working of religion, to secure good and great citizens to the republic, and to fuse into one mighty whole the descendants of Irishmen in America, it would be the speedy formation of a Celtic alliance, modelled on that of the universal Jewish alliance.

Believe me, men do not know, for it requires more than superficial observation and limited experience, how powerfully this blending into one mighty force of all the individual intelligence, wealth and energy of the Hebrew race all over the world contributes to make the home of the Jewish family what you have partly described it to be, and to enable the Jewish youth to profit by such instruction as our schools give them and the Jewish people in every land to rise to that supremacy of intelligence and wealth which promises them so controlling a position in modern social life.

Such an alliance as I have in my mind would collect together once and for all time the fragments into which the protracted oppression and action of the British ascendancy in Ireland has split and ground a race no less noble than the Hebrew. It would be the realization of that glorious dream of brotherhood so long cherished by the saints, statesmen, and poets of Celtic Ireland. It would help not a little to restore dear old Ireland to herself once more. It would be a priceless service to our own free America.

Have priests and parents always or often thought what glorious materials they have in the children which fill both parochial school and Sunday school? BERNARD O'REILLY.

SOUTH AMERICAN LEPERS.

A Bishop from Dutch Guiana Asks Aid for Sufferers There.

There are, it appears, lepers nearer this part of the country than the Sandwich Islands. Bishop W. A. F. Wulfingh of Surinam, better known as Dutch Guiana, is in this country to call the attention of the charitable to the unfortunate condition of that province, where leprosy has taken a firm hold upon the wretched inhabitants, and where it has as yet been impossible to provide even the simplest means of preventing the spread of the disease. How faithfully the missionaries have done what they could themselves before making this appeal to the outside world for relief is shown by the fact that three of them have caught the dreadful disease and one is now dying from it.

Bishop Wulfingh arrived in this country a month ago from Rotterdam, where he had been to describe the situation of Surinam to the Dutch Government, and to charitable Hollanders generally. He visited Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, and has been in this city for a week. He will return to Amsterdam in a few days, and thence will sail on July 24 for Paramaribo, the chief city of his diocese. The province subject to the Bishop is on the northern coast of South America, between the Orinoco and the Amazon rivers, and is, to a large extent, an unexplored wilderness, inhabited by aboriginal tribes, many of which are believed never to have been seen by white men. The colonists live along the coast, and even they who have spent their lives there know little of the interior or of the people who live in the vast forests and swamps which stretch away hundreds of miles into the continent. One object of Bishop Wulfingh's work is to open up this unexplored land and to establish a chain of mission posts there at short distances from each other. His principal work for a long time, however, must be with the inhabitants along the coast, who are, so far as natives are concerned, descendants of the original Caribbean tribes that Columbus found in possession of the islands which were the first discovered of the western hemisphere. They are known as the Carib, Arow, and Arowak tribes, each differing considerably from the others in language and customs, but all degenerated to almost the lowest state of existence. Mingled with them are many coolies, who have been imported as laborers from British India, and a very large contingent of emancipated negroes. All classes alike are sunk in the deepest immorality and ignorance, and of recent years their excesses have brought upon them the plague of leprosy, which has increased at a frightful rate. A leper station has been established at Batavia, but the laws requiring isolation are not enforced, so there are more lepers scattered through the colony than there are at the station. In their work at the missions the Redemptorist Fathers, who are in charge of the work, have been brought into constant contact with the lepers. Of the three priests who have contracted the disease, one, the Rev. John Baker, is now dying among the lepers at the station at Batavia.

The first work of the Bishop upon his return will be to erect at Batavia a suitable hospital for the lepers, and to engage the services of Catholic Sisters to nurse them. It was to obtain funds for this purpose that his visit to Holland and this country was undertaken. He says that his mission has been a success, and that his applications for financial assistance have been generously responded to, especially in this country. Much money is needed, however, for immediate work, and more will be necessary from time to time for many years, until the leprosy is stamped out of existence in Surinam. The Bishop's companion during his trip about this country has been the Rev. Charles Currier of 1,545 Tremont street, Boston, who was himself once a missionary in Guiana, and who will receive funds for use among the lepers there.

New Yorkers might be expected to take a special interest in Bishop Wulfingh's mission, since Great Britain and Holland 200 years ago made an even swap of the provinces of New York and Surinam, or Dutch Guiana. At that time, 1669, Great Britain had been holding New York for a while by force of arms, but it was really a Dutch colony, while the Dutch had captured Surinam, which was really an English colony. When the terms of peace were arranged it was decided that each should keep what it had. So the Dutch gave up New York, and the English yielded Surinam. The English believed they had the worst of the bargain, and there was great indignation in London because so great a province as Surinam had been traded off for so petty a one as New York. Surinam now has about 60,000 inhabitants, and is about the poorest colony the Dutch have, returning practically nothing for the expense of governing it. The greater part of its inhabitants are classed as Protestants. Bishop Wulfingh is being aided in his work, however, by both Protestants and Catholics.

An Incident of a Mugwump's Canvass.

From the Somerville Journal.

Seeing Bishop Potter and Col. Higginson together on the Sanders Theatre platform Thursday, both wearing the pink and blue ribbons which Phi Beta Kappa men so highly prize, the "Penciller" was reminded of a story which the Bishop loves to tell as an illustration of Col. Higginson's practical experience of politics.

When Col. Higginson was running for Congress two years ago the Bishop says, a friend of his, a gentleman living in Cambridge, visited the polls election day to see how the colored vote was going. In one of the ward rooms he met a colored man who had formerly been in his employ, and going up to him he asked:

"Well, George, who is your favorite candidate to-day?"

The colored brother named the man for whom he was going to vote, and, to the grief of his former employer, it was not the name of Col. Higginson that he gave.

"You don't mean to say, George," said the Colonel's friend, "that you are going to vote that way? Why, I should think that your sense of honor and of gratitude would lead you to cast your ballot for a man who has done so much as Col. Higginson has for you and for all the people of your race."

But the colored brother had different ideas. "I should tink, sah," he replied, "dat my sense ob honor and ob gratitude would lead me to vote for de gemman what guv me $2.50."

ITALY'S PRIME MINISTER.

The Strange Career of Francesco Crispi—His Marriages—The Obstacles in His Way and How He Overcame Them all.

LONDON, June 18.—With Count Andrassy the last of the diplomats and statesmen of the school of Metternich, Beust, and Talleyrand disappeared; in the dearth of successors of the same high order, minor intellects have succeeded to the place left vacant in the political firmament. It is due in some measure to the absence of completely great minds and matchless capacities that Signor Crispi, the Italian premier, owes the preponderance he has obtained so late in years, and the influence he exercises over the destinies of his country, although it must in justice be said that he is gifted with a considerable amount of genuine ability and statecraft.

That his tenure of office will not prove an unmitigated benefit to Italy will probably sooner or later become evident, but that he has contrived to keep his place and bridge over difficult moments is indisputable. According to an oft-quoted saying of the Abbé Galliani, "The Italian plays with words, the Frenchman is duped by them." This is possibly why France tries to persuade herself now that what she has considered a hostile attitude of the Crispi Cabinet was only a misunderstanding; why Europe, who was aghast when Prince Bismarck assumed the double functions of Prussian and German Minister of State, accepted without demur that the Prime Minister of King Humbert should in a constitutional and parliamentary Government centralize in his own hands the Presidency of the Council and the portfolios of Foreign Affairs and of the Interior; nor was there any inordinate surprise expressed when this cumulative power was placed at the service of one ally, Germany.

Yet Signor Crispi had for many years haunted the Republican and Socialistic quarters of the Batignolles and the revolutionary Parisian Faubourgs, when, a very young man, he lived abroad as a political refugee. But the ardent enthusiasts of 1848 succumbed, like many others, in appearance equally irreconcilable, to the magical influence Bismarck exercised over the whole world. Andrassy himself, who in the remote days of his youth had also sought the shelter of Paris, who had been the disciple of the fiery Kossuth, became at a given moment the devoted friend of the omnipotent Chancellor.

Francesco Crispi is now a man of 71. He does not look old, he dresses elegantly and carefully, repudiating in all his person the *sans façon* of the classical democrat. His head has a semi-martial cast, his hair is scanty, but his thick, white moustache recalls Victor Emmanuel's; his eye is brilliant, his speech sharp, incisive, full of imagery and sometimes slightly declamatory. He has a wonderful capacity for work, sustained by the self-gratification of a well-established power, grasped late in life, for he was 69 when he at last reaped the harvest for which he had been toiling nearly half a century.

Crispi was born in October, 1819, in a little Sicilian town called Ribera. According to tradition, the family, of Latin origin, emigrated to the East, and in the Nineteenth century a Crispi was Prince of Samos. "Don Cicció," as the Sicilians familiarly called the Prime Minister, affects a profound contempt for the genealogical tree, and loudly declares that he has no belief in long descent or hereditary nobility, claiming to be only of the people. Nevertheless, he cannot prevent the world from knowing—and the knowledge explains his ecclesiastical policy—that his immediate branch of the family came from Albania to Sicily and remained Greek in religion; that his grandfather was an Orthodox priest and sent him to be educated at the Greek seminary of Palermo, where Albanian was as currently spoken as Italian.

Crispi, one of six children, respected his father, but was tenderly affectionate toward his mother. At 18 he fell desperately in love with a pretty peasant girl as poor as she was beautiful, and set all opposition aside by running away with her and marrying her in secret. Whether she would have had to repent her confidence was not put to the test, for the girl died, happily for herself no doubt, two years afterward. The young widower applied himself steadfastly to the study of law; he eventually distinguished himself in his profession, and acquired a great celebrity as an advocate, with the substantial advantages of a good income. The astuteness of the lawyer has often served the statesman in after life.

Like all the men of his tendencies who professed to be patriots, Francesco Crispi embraced journalism during the troubled times preceding '48, and even, with other exalted youths, founded a paper, diversifying politics with snatches of rather clever poetry. As was to be expected, the whole editorial staff got into difficulties with the Neapolitan Government and was finally banished the kingdom. Crispi came to England, where he gave lessons in Italian, Greek, Latin, and French. He speaks the latter language perfectly, but with an ineradicable Sicilian accent. He neither secured enough pupils nor mastered the English tongue sufficiently to become a competent teacher, found it impossible to earn a livelihood, and left London for Malta.

Meanwhile King Ferdinand II. died, and Crispi, who had become Mazzini's follower, obtained from that fervent patriot one of the passports with which he kept himself abundantly supplied and reëntered Italy. He inspired the expedition of the "Thousand of Melazzo," of which he was the leading and dominant spirit, although bodily hiding in the house of a faithful baker in Florence. When the great victory was won and the first step toward the unification of Italy taken by the translation of the capital from Turin to the old city of the Medici, Crispi, no longer a rebel and refugee, indulged in his taste for building and erected a fine large house in the new metropolis at which he frequently entertained Garibaldi and other supporters of the common cause.

His second wife had accompanied him during the whole of the Garibaldian campaign, and, like Anita Garibaldi, had shared all his hardships and dangers with unflinching, unhesitating devotion, but suddenly, when she should have reaped her reward in her husband's gratitude and honorable position Crispi, deeply enamored of a younger and more attractive woman, abandoned her without compunction in favor of her rival. This brutal conduct for a time marred his career. The Queen of Italy at first obstinately refused to see this third wife, and it was only said that, divorce not existing in Italy, the last union was illegal. A great deal of sympathy was felt for the forsaken woman, and little heed was given to the plea he alleged in extenuation of his attitude toward her, which was the duty of legitimizing a daughter born of the later connection.

But even public and royal indignation fell before Crispi's extraordinary good fortune, and the obstacles in his way to supreme power vanished as if by enchantment. The Albanian Greek, the political refugee of the Batignolles, the Neapolitan rebel, the husband of three wives, two of whom are living, is the Premier of Italy; he wears the collar of the Annunziata, which confers on him the rank of cousin of the King and Signora Crispi No. 3, with the title of Excellency, goes to court and sits beside Queen Margherita at the Quirinal. Signora Crispi No. 2, the heroine of 1860, drags a miserable, lonely, and dishonored existence at Florence.

Of his forensic training Crispi has retained a remarkable fluency and precision of speech. He is irascible, intolerant of opposition, and as fiery in his old age as when he wrote incendiary articles in his own paper forty years ago. In his seat in the House he is never still, and when he answers an opponent or silences an adversary he almost bounds to his feet, throws his chest forward, gesticulates violently, and from beneath his white moustache pours forth the torrents of an eloquence which is often bitter, but rarely fails to deal a straight, crushing blow. In private life he can be as affable as he is forbidding and dangerous in public; his friends are wont to declare that familiar intercourse with him is delightful, but all too rare. Like all great workers he rises early; summer and winter he is at his desk at 6 o'clock, and labors indefatigably; temperate to a degree, he never drinks anything stronger than wine and water, and spends barely half an hour at his meals. It is difficult to obtain an audience from the Italian Premier, overwhelming occupations taking up every precious minute; he receives standing, listens without interrupting, and is impatient of interlocutors who are not brief and lucid. He answers shortly, never takes notes, and trusts entirely to his excellent memory.

In matters of administration, of external and internal policy, he is decided, rapid, fearless, and unbiassed; he is independent equally of plutocracy, aristocracy, and hierarchy, with a singular mixture of recklessness, weakness, and arrogance. It is by sheer arrogance that he has lifted himself to his present pinnacle, and the same arrogance prompts him to talk of himself as immovable, to announce what he proposes doing in ten or twenty years, as if death itself were powerless to remove him from his post. He brooks no criticism; the attacks of the press infuriate him, and more than once in the vengeful ebullition of his rage he has been tempted to take regrettable steps.

Signor Crispi is universally and unsparingly abused in the Peninsula by Liberals, Conservatives, and Democrats, and especially by Roman Catholics, who look upon him as the Antichrist. For some he is too French; for others too German; but in spite of all antagonism he remains absolute dictator in the Italian Chamber, and is at least as much flattered and courted as he is hated. Posterity, whose judgment is always surer and broader, will probably say that Crispi's mind and temperament were not sufficiently well balanced to make him a model statesman, but when he took the rudder his predecessors at the helm had already shown the [illegible] and prepared the useful alliances of which the success and credit now redound to him; but it will say also that no other man would at the time have filled his place so well. M. DE S.